

REMARKS

This submission is in response to the non-final Office Action mailed December 10, 2011. Claims 1-5, 7-14 and 21-56 are pending in this application. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.112.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects various claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner objects to certain language in claims 3, 31 and 38.

As a first matter, Applicants wish to clarify the claims that are allowed and those rejected. In the Office Action Summary, the Examiner indicates that claims 37, 47 and 51 are rejected. However, paragraph 3 of the Office Action does not state that claims 47 or 51 are rejected, or explain how any of these three claims are rejected. Further, claim 37 (indirectly) depends from independent claim 34, claim 47 (indirectly) depends from independent claim 2, and claim 51 depends from independent claim 1, all of which are allowed.

In addition, paragraph 3 of the Office Action states that claims 34-36 and 55 are rejected. However, the Office Action Summary states that these claims are allowed.

Therefore, it is Applicants' understanding that claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 23, 24, 31-33, 38-40, 50, 52, 54 and 56 are subject to the rejections set forth in the Office Action, and that all other pending claims are allowable. Applicants' response herein is made on this basis.

Applicants wish to thank the Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview conducted on even date, March 10, 2011. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b) and MPEP § 713.04, Applicants' statement regarding the substance of the interview is as follows. Applicants' attorney, the undersigned, and the Examiner discussed the claim amendments herein

with respect to claims 3, 31 and 38. The Examiner agreed that the amendments would overcome the pending rejection.

Thus, claims 3, 31 and 38 have been amended herein as discussed in the interview to delete the second recitation of the language referenced by the Examiner in the Office Action. Accordingly, the phrases on each side of the “or” in these sections of the claims pertain to the same, first-recited “portion.” That is, there is one “portion” that is either (i) planar and substantially parallel to the back edge or (ii) planar and extends at the recited angle. Applicants submit the amended claims merely restate what was already recited in the claim, and thus no narrowing of scope is effected. Applicants thus respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that all issues raised by the Examiner have been addressed, and the application is in condition for allowance. A timely allowance is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with the Applicants’ attorney would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

Applicants believe that no additional fee is required (other than those submitted herewith). However, if an additional fee or extension is required, please consider this to be a petition therefore, and Applicants’ attorney hereby authorizes that any such fees be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-3569.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 10, 2011

By: /Kevin L. Reiner/
Kevin L. Reiner (Reg. No. 43,040)
Attorney for Applicants

PTO Correspondence Address:

McCarter & English, LLP

CityPlace I

185 Asylum Street

Hartford, CT 06103

Phone: (860) 275-6756

Fax: (860) 724-3397